

NEW YORK JOURNAL AND ADVERTISER

W. R. HEARST.

AN AMERICAN PAPER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

AN AMERICAN INTERNAL POLICY.

FIRST—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.

The Values Created by the Community Should Belong to the Community.

SECOND—DESTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL TRUSTS.

No Monopolization of the National Resources by Lawless Private Combinations More Powerful Than the People's Government.

THIRD—A GRADUATED INCOME TAX.

Every Citizen to Contribute to the Support of the Government According to His Means, and Not According to His Necessities.

FOURTH—ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

The Senate, Now Becoming the Private Property of Corporations and Bosses, to be Made Truly Representative, and the State Legislatures to be Redeemed from Recurring Scandals.

FIFTH—NATIONAL, STATE AND MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

As the Duties of Citizenship Are Both General and Local, Every Government, General and Local, Should Do Its Share Toward Fitting Every Individual to Perform Them.

SIXTH—CURRENCY REFORM.

All the Nation's Money to be Issued by the Nation's Government, and Its Supply to be Regulated by the People and Not by the Banks.

SEVENTH—NO PROTECTION FOR OPPRESSIVE TRUSTS.

Organizations Powerful Enough to Oppress the People Are No Longer "Infant Industries."

ALGER ON ALGERISM.

Secretary Alger's by the irrefutable testimony of the markets threatened statement—by the fact that the prices of all the necessities of life are going down from decade to decade. We have hardly begun as yet to scratch the earth's resources for supporting human life. A ranch forty miles square—and there are larger ranches than that in the West—could raise wheat enough to supply the entire population of Greater New York. With twice the present population of the globe the United States would be sparsely settled. The boggy of over-population is a purely theoretical danger. It has never existed in fact, and the probability is that it never will exist. The real danger is that long before population begins to press on the means of subsistence, the scarcity of large families will make it necessary everywhere, as now in France, to try to devise some means to perpetuate the race.

Mr. Alger explains that his defence is called out by the criticisms of the newspapers, and especially by a recent article in the London Times. The London Times, of course, fell into numberless exaggerations and errors, as was to be expected when a paper without any knowledge of the facts, undertook to pass sweeping judgments. But the Algerine defence is even more vulnerable than the Times's attack.

For instance, the embalmist statesman absolutely denies that army officers at the beginning of the Spanish war were appointed through political pulls. What, then, was the nature of the pull that secured the appointment of Mr. Fred M. Alger, son of the Secretary of War, as Captain?

How about George S. Hobart, nephew of Vice-President Hobart, appointed Major and Assistant Adjutant-General?

What of the illustrious Russell B. Harrison, son of ex-President Benjamin Harrison, jumped over a long list of faithful officers and made Major and Inspector-General after winning national fame by his record of all-round national incapacity?

What about James G. Blaine, Jr., appointed Captain in the face of his notoriously bad reputation, and reappointed to a higher position after having been dropped from the rolls for disgracing the service at Honolulu? These are only a few of the dozens of Sons of Somebodies who obtained commissions to which they had no claim but that of their pull. If Mr. Alger would explain their appointment he might be credited with the ability to explain the others of the same kind.

A USE FOUND FOR DUKES.

There is a picture in our London contemporary, the Sketch, representing the Duke of Manchester wearing a white apron and carrying a tray of glasses and bottles. The character he represents is described as "an American bartender," but it is obviously a Coney Island waiter.

The Duke gave his services as a dispenser of straight and mixed drinks for the benefit of the Charing Cross Hospital at its recent bazaar in the Albert Hall. It was philanthropy that incited his action, but he may find an advantage in it yet. It was demonstrated that a duke can make a very decent sort of waiter, and the time may come when the knowledge will prove extremely useful.

THE MALTHUSIAN BOGY.

A morning contemporary has undertaken the defence of Malthusianism, which it takes every opportunity to exploit. It lays down the rule that "population tends to increase faster than the means of subsistence."

This maxim has such vague, theoretical truth as would be contained in the proposition that a man walking westward from the Mississippi tends to get to the top of Pike's Peak. Practically, as regards the conditions of the present age, it is totally false—not only lacking in truth, but actually reversing it.

Of course, if the earth had twenty times its present population, and if the proportion of births to deaths that now prevails in countries like Germany then prevailed everywhere, there would be a tendency for population to increase faster than the means of subsistence. But at present the means of subsistence are increasing faster than population, as is mathematically demonstrated.

GENERALS AND "SKULKERS."

The wounded soldiers coming home on the Relief denounce Otis for cowardice and incompetence. The Nebraska and Utah volunteers in San Francisco, attending a theatrical performance as guests of the city, hissed the General's portrait. General Shafter says that the soldiers who criticize Otis are skulkers. The "skulkers" on the Relief all managed to get wounded. Neither Shafter nor Otis ever went under fire, and the only wound either of them got in the whole course of his campaign was administered to Shafter by the open hand of a newspaper correspondent. As the blow landed on the hero's cheek it did no harm.

THE INFLUENCE OF MIND OVER BODY.

It is said that a young dental student is near death's door on account of the anxiety caused by a gypsy's prediction that he will soon die.

Superstition has played a wonderful role throughout man's history—or really it is not wonderful, since science has told us of the immense power that the mind exercises over the body. That is the simple explanation of the influence of omens, good and bad. That is why so many even strong minded men and women still dislike to see for the first time the moon over their left shoulder. If one man firmly tells another that he will die on a certain day, it often may have deplorable consequences.

It also explains the otherwise inexplicable power of "Christian Science." That this faith sometimes has cured its devotees is beyond doubt. But the cure has been accomplished only in nervous diseases—that is, in cases where the mind, acting on the body, can restore the normal state; never in cases where the bones, the organs or the tissues are affected. The mind can both cure and kill.

A WIFE RETALIATES.

For generations men have been bequeathing property to their wives with the proviso, "so long as she shall remain my widow," and women have bowed to these decrees.

In a recent case the circumstances have been reversed, but the husband is less submissive. He is raising objections. Margaret Peterson willed a share of her property to her husband "as long as he remained single." Should he marry the children are to have everything. The will says: "Should he take another wife he must go out and have nothing more to do with anything that belongs to the children in houses or anything else I possess."

Mrs. Peterson was evidently quite determined that, literally at least, no other woman should occupy her place. Possibly she had a firm belief in the readiness of widowers to accept consolation. Perhaps even Mr. Peterson had given her reason to suppose that not all the charms of life would depart with her. There certainly is human nature and a good deal of it in the command, "The woman known as Parpen never to be allowed to put foot inside of any place that ever belonged to me."

Can it be sympathy for "the woman known as Parpen," who is thus excluded, that makes Mr. Peterson so anxious to break the will?

TYRANTS OF CHILDREN.

Surprisingly large numbers of parents seem entirely ignorant of the first principles of child training. They persistently cling to the barbarous old combination of "lickin' and larnin'," in which our great grandfathers so ardently believed.

A short time ago a man chastised his daughter most unmercifully because she failed to pass a school examination. Now the father of little Marion Kutsch is awaiting trial for brutally beating her because she missed some of the questions in her lessons. He struck her on the head so violently that she had to be taken to the hospital.

When will parents learn that abuse of the body has no power to develop the mind? On the contrary, a child who is in constant fear of a blow cannot give proper attention to its lesson. A little judicious approval will do more to stimulate effort than any amount of whipping. Children need encouragement far more than blame.

While so much is being constantly said of the need of training to fit women for motherhood, these cases and many other records of the stupidity and brutality of men to their children would seem to indicate that specific instruction was necessary to teach men the duties of fatherhood.

COUNT BONI DE CASTELLANE has really accomplished something at last. He has succeeded in making a contract for the sale of his photographs, by which he is to get 30 per cent of the proceeds, which is as much as was given to the Princess de Chimay. But Boni need not flatter himself that he has the Chimay's popularity until he reads the returns from the sales.

BY THE NATURALIZATION of William Waldorf Astor as a British subject hundreds of New York houses become the property of an alien. There might be some difficulty in framing laws to discourage the ownership of real estate by non-resident Americans, but there is none in the case of aliens. Some States have already done it. Mr. Astor's action was timely and fortunate.

Compulsory Arbitration.

Editor New York Journal: I am proud to see your name under an article headed, "The Need of Compulsory Arbitration." In this you are true to the principles enunciated in your great newspaper ever since you have taken hold of it.

Arbitration would and should settle all such disputes. I will go further and say that arbitration could settle many, if not all, of the cases which are at present being settled by unreasonable and costly processes at law, necessitating a legion of judges, lawyers and court officials.

Our lawmakers write our laws and darken them by such a cloud of verbiage that it requires the said legion to explain to the people the meaning of the language used.

Why in the name of common sense cannot these lawmakers, many, yes, most of them versed in law, use such language that when a dispute arises three or more intelligent citizens acting as arbitrators can settle the matter, without forcing poor people who are very often unable to bear the expenses of law to submit their cases to judge and jury, and, if dissatisfied with the decision, appeal to a higher court? And, if unwilling to abide by the finding of that body, still appeal to a higher one, until in this process of legal kicking the dispute reaches the United States Supreme Judges?

By all means agitate that question, as you are doing in many others, for the general good. But let me tell you that you have a hard row to hoe. But you have a good hoe, and good muscle behind, and although there are rocks and weeds along the length of that row in the shape of political corruption and selfish rascality in many shapes and forms, the nation may hope. If your good right arm grows not weary (and I believe it won't), to see a beautiful row of corn at harvest time delighting the eyes of the American people. Hopefully yours, N. E. MATHEWSON.

Boston, Mass., July 19, 1899.

"Discouraged Wage Earner" Comes Back.

Editor New York Journal: In reply to B. M. T. I would like to say that his or "her" statements simply prove that my "plaintive wall" is not wholly without reason. He says that fifteen dollars is sufficient for suitable accommodations in Brooklyn. So do I, but the other and dearest half of me thinks that my stupendous income of seventy-five dollars warrants an eighteen-dollar flat. (Cause for "plaintive wall" No. 1.)

"His grocery bill of twenty-five dollars for two people is extravagant." Again I agree with my fair critic (assuming that "he" is a woman), but I have to pay for whatever my better half orders, just the same. This is a condition, not a theory. (Cause for plaintive wall No. 2.) She thinks that the cow's milk bill is too high, but is willing to let it go. This is really good of her, and if we were both unencumbered how nice we could get along together in that fifteen-dollar flat!

"Laundry expense seems high. If his wife is in good health." The way we agree is marvellous, but there's my wife again. (Cause for plaintive wall No. 3.)

"Knows lots of men with families who earn only fifty or sixty dollars a month, and with the help of their wives are 'hilariously happy.' Maybe it was the lee which they bought with that \$1.40. How happy I could be with one of those wives!" I suppose I shall continue to wait until I can secure the "lachrymose" consideration of one of those healthy and helpful wives.

F. N. C. Discouraged Wage Earner.

Socialism and Religion.

Editor New York Journal: In answer to Mr. John Steele's letter of recent date, I beg leave to say that a thoroughly conscientious Socialist cannot be a religionist, and an honest, sincere religionist cannot be a Socialist. To be a religionist is to be a believer in the invisible, in the impossible, in fate, in miracles and in chimeras. To be a Socialist is to be a believer in the visible, in the possible, in nature, in truth, in the real.

Religion teaches us to obey a king, to accept everything, whether good or bad, as the will of God, and to be thankful to Him for it.

It teaches us, also, to submit to oppression, to tyranny, and to be thankful for it. It teaches us to oppose oppression, to resist against tyranny and to accept nothing but that which is true, which is just, which is natural, which is humane.

The Bible tells us to accept poverty and be thankful for it; that it is a virtue recognized by God.

Socialism tells us that poverty is unnatural; that it is the result of the unjust, unequal and selfish system of government under which we live; that it is an evil, and must be remedied.

SAMUEL A. LEWIN.

No. 139 Forsyth street, July 26, 1899.

Work for One Old Man.

Editor New York Journal: I have about a week's work at printing and paper hanging in my house at address below, which I would be glad to let Mr. J. Hill do, if he will call and satisfy me that he is competent. You would oblige me greatly by communicating with him or sending me his address. I have been looking for just such a man. Respectfully,

MRS. G. A. BOUSCHER.

No. 141 West Twenty-first street.

THE OLD WHITEWASHED BUCKET.

McKinley to Alger.

Executive Mansion, Washington, July 20.

Hon. R. A. Alger, Secretary of War: In thus severing the official relation which has continued for more than two years, I desire to thank you for the FAITHFUL SERVICE YOU HAVE RENDERED THE COUNTRY AT A MOST EXACTING PERIOD.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

Alger on McKinley.

"For a little over a thousand appointments made by the President, the number of applications was over 25,000, and each application was accompanied by a certificate of ability. I would be only too glad to have the honor to have made these appointments."

"No better, no more loyal or more patriotic set of men as a whole ever served their country. AND THEIR APPOINTMENTS WERE A CREDIT NOT ONLY TO APPOINTING POWER, but to the country they served.—Alger's statement to the Press.



DEMOCRATIC LEADERS FAVOR MORE RIGID PARTY LINES.

THE statement made by Vice-Chairman Stone at the recent Democratic National Committee conference that the Democratic party must maintain its individuality and allow no other party or faction to control its reorganization has aroused great interest throughout the country. It has brought into prominence the question of alliances and the taking into the fold of kindred, yet independent parties.

So great is the importance of this step that the Journal has asked the leaders of the Democratic party in all parts of the country the following questions:

"Do you favor strict adherence to party lines in the coming campaign?"

"Do you favor admitting to the regular Democratic councils Silver Republicans, Populists and adherents of other parties?"

The answers of these leaders give their views on the future of the Democratic party and its policy toward the many factions which parallel its path.

CLARK HOWELL, Democratic National Committee man from Georgia—While favoring strict adherence to party lines in the coming campaign, I am not opposed to conferring fully and freely with representatives of such other organizations as wish to co-operate with the Democratic party. With the reaffirmation of the platform of '96 and the renomination of Mr. Bryan, both of which seem sure, the Democratic party will secure the co-operation of both Populists and silver Republicans, all working in harmony with the Democratic party.

Populist disintegration in the South has practically eliminated that party as a factor in the situation in the Southern States. The only possible danger of a revival of Populism would be in the surrender of the majority of the party to the minority which was opposed to the platform of '96. The refusal to reaffirm that platform would lose the party ten votes where its rejection would gain one.

J. M. TERRELL, Attorney-General of Georgia—I favor admitting none but those who accept as their faith the principles of Democracy and agree to be bound by the nominations regularly made in Democratic conventions.

PHILIP COOK, Secretary of State of Georgia—I am in favor of strict adherence to party lines. I am opposed to the sacrifice of an party principle, even though by so doing the party would be successful at the polls.

I would be glad for those outside the party who wish for the success of Democratic principles to attend the councils of the party in an advisory capacity. In the convention, however, I believe it is essential that the identity of the party be strictly maintained.

JAMES D. PHELPS, Mayor of San Francisco—The Democratic party should be made big and broad enough to embrace every sincere and rational reformer. There is no public benefit nor party advantage in fusion.

R. F. DEL VALLE, San Francisco—I agree with former Governor Stone. Fusion has never been a success. Republicans can only win on a platform like ours, and they know it. They may affiliate with whom they please. We can win alone.

RICHARD B. COLLINS, San Francisco—It is my opinion that all Democratic organizations should stand together, and strictly by Democratic

The conservative gold Democrats are beginning to recognize that the wisest policy for the Democratic party to pursue is to reaffirm the platform, hold the party together and present a solid front in the next campaign.

As to the special prominence to be given the currency question, aside from the general endorsement of the platform, that should and will depend upon developments at the approaching session of Congress. principles. I believe that the affiliations with outside parties have cost the party more votes and lost us more prestige in the past than they have gained. Let us put up a solid front on good old Democratic principles only and without side issues, and we cannot fail to win our fight.

OSCAR HOCKS, Chairman Central Democratic Club, San Francisco—I agree with Governor Stone. The Democratic party should avoid affiliation with any other party.

FRANK CAMPBELL, Chairman New York County Gold Democrats—Whenever the Democratic State Committee—I was very much pleased with what I saw of Governor Stone at the Chicago conference. He is a good Democrat, and I agree, in the main, with his views. The Democratic party must certainly maintain its individuality, as it is one of the two great political parties of the country. Our party is, of course, pleased to have its nominees and principles supported by voters, no matter what their past affiliations may have been. I favor admitting to the party all voters who wish to be Democrats.

As a Democrat I shall be glad to see all men within its ranks who favor an economical and wise democratic administration of national affairs. We should not try to drive voters away, but rather bring voters to us. This was one of the reasons why I at the recent Chicago conference insisted that the National Committee had no business in dealing with the nomination of candidates or the declaration of issues. Such matters must be left to the delegates to the next national convention. And what they determine upon must be accepted as the will of the party.

If Governor Stone's advice is taken I believe that much will have been accomplished toward restoring Democratic harmony in New York and placing the State again where she really belongs in the Democratic column.

GEORGE M. VAN HOFSEN, Chairman of the

Tammany Hall General Committee—I am always a party man. I am not in favor of handing over the Democratic party to the members of any other organization. So far as the votes of the Populists and other organizations are concerned, I think the Democratic party ought to be very glad to get them. But the candidates should be Democratic and the platform Democratic. It is always dangerous to sacrifice the principles of a party to catch a passing breeze and get outside votes.

It would be simply suicidal to make the Democratic party a silver Republican party, a Populist party or anything else than a Democratic party. All new questions should be dealt with by men of the present, and not by those who live in the past. I really think Governor Stone has hit the nail on the head. If his ideas are carried out, we shall have Democratic candidates, Democratic principles and a glorious Democratic victory in 1900.

EDWARD M. SHEPARD, leader of the Kings County Gold Democrats—Whenever the Democratic party has nominated a pure Democrat for office, on almost pure Democratic platforms, it had usually won. When, however, it has wandered after false gods it has almost invariably been beaten. The sooner the Democratic party gets back to true Democratic principles the sooner it will begin to achieve its old-time victories. These are the only conditions I desire to make on Governor Stone's statement.

JACOB A. CANTOR, former Democratic leader of the New York State Senate—Governor Stone is now preaching the true Democratic doctrine. If it is followed, hope for Democratic success in 1900 will be greatly enhanced. Let the next Democratic National Convention nominate real Democratic candidates and enunciate real Democratic principles, and the party will come together and win. But if the Democratic party persists, as it did in 1896, in catering to the Populists, the Silver Republicans and elements of that description, the outlook for 1900 will be black indeed. The quicker we get right back to the genuine Thomas Jefferson idea of Democracy the quicker will the party be restored to power in the State and nation.

The Populists are, I understand, breaking up as a party. If we can have a straightaway race between the real Republican and real Democratic party next year, well, I would wager just a bit on the Democratic party.